SUM BUNNY

BLIND SPOT LIGHT

BLIND SPOT LIGHT

Blind Spots Have Mass

Entrenchment, Scale, and the Geometry of Ignorance

By Sum Bunny

2025

ARK HIVE PRESS

OPEN THROTTLE
CC BY 4.0

YOU ARE FREE

to share and adapt the material for any purpose,
even commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given.

BLIND SPOT LIGHT

Blind Spots Have Mass: Entrenchment, Scale, and the Geometry of Ignorance

By Sum Bunny

I. A Provisional Intuition

When driving, larger vehicles often have larger blind spots. This is not because they are poorly designed, but because scale introduces occlusion: mass creates zones that cannot be directly seen from the driver's position.

This physical intuition raises a fundamental question for systems theory: **does increasing scale in systems introduce blind spots that are not merely larger, but harder to correct?**

We posit that blind spots in complex systems possess a property analogous to mass. This is not a rhetorical flourish; it is a structural claim. By "mass," we mean **persistence, accumulated consequence, and resistance to correction.** The larger the system, the more energy is required to shift its gaze.

II. What a Blind Spot Is (And Is Not)

To understand this resistance, we must purify our definition.

Ignorance is a void; a blind spot is a structure.

A blind spot is not a failure of the system to look; it is the necessary shadow cast by the system's successful orientation. To observe *X* is to distinguish it from everything that is not-*X*. The system cannot observe its own distinction-making process in the moment of making it. Therefore, the blind spot is not an error. It is the product of the system working exactly as designed.

III. Entrenchment as the Source of Blindness

If blind spots are structural, how do they acquire mass? Nelson Goodman, in *Ways of Worldmaking*, offers the concept of **entrenchment**.

For Goodman, we categorize based on what has successfully predicted the past. When a predicate (a label, a category, a legal term) works, we use it again. Over time, these predicates become "entrenched." They become the default tools of our worldmaking.

Entrenchment is efficient, but it is also exclusionary. The more entrenched a predicate becomes, the less room there is for rival descriptions to register as candidates for truth. Alternatives do not fail the test of validity; they fail to appear for the test at all. The system becomes blind to them because it is optimizing for projectibility based on past success.

IV. Law and Operational Closure

We see this dynamic clearly in the legal history analyzed by Manuel Bastias Saavedra. In examining the transformation of property rights, Bastias Saavedra demonstrates how modern law achieves "operational closure."

The legal system functions by translating social conflicts into binary code: *Is this legal or illegal?* In doing so, the law does not exclude difference; it renders only certain differences observable. It sees the contract; it is structurally blind to the sentimental value of the land. This blindness is not a malfunction. It is the prerequisite for the law's claim to equality. To treat cases "equally," the law must blind itself to the infinite particularities that make them different.

V. The Geometry of Scale

We now turn to the relationship between entrenchment and scale.

If blind spots arise from the necessity of operational closure, then scale acts as a multiplier of rigidity. A small system—a family, a village council—can operate with "thick," specific predicates. It can handle high variance because the volume of interactions is low.

However, under conditions of scale, a distinct trade-off reliably occurs: **larger systems must rely on fewer, more general predicates to remain operable.**

To govern a nation or a global economy, a system cannot afford "thick" descriptions. It must standardize. It must average. Therefore, we assert a structural relationship: **increasing scale reduces the degrees of freedom per unit of lived complexity.** The "mass" of the blind spot is the structural delta between the simplified map required for global management and the complex territory of local reality.

VI. Blind Spots and Load

In the context of *The Universal Basic Equation* (TUBE), this unobserved delta is not a vacuum. It is a **load**.

What is not rendered by the system does not disappear; it remains causally active, exerting **pressure without representation.** The unobserved variables—uncompensated labor, localized toxicity, sentimental valuation—persist outside the system's descriptive field, interacting and accumulating consequences.

This creates **deferred contradiction.** The system proceeds as if its map is the territory, while the unmapped territory exerts force back on the system. Legitimacy stress and "unexpected" crises are the sound of a blind spot shifting under the weight of what it ignored. The blind spot has mass because the ignored reality has force.

VII. Second-Order Observation

It is crucial to state that this essay does not argue *inside* any specific system. We are not arguing for "better laws" or "more data." We are engaging in **second-order observation**: we are observing how systems observe.

We are noting that the driver cannot see the bumper, not because the driver is incompetent, but because the vehicle is built that way.

VIII. Self-Containment and Humility

This analysis must end with a recursive acknowledgement. This essay itself is a product of abstraction. By discussing "systems" in general, we are utilizing the very tools of simplification we have just critiqued. We are creating our own blind spot regarding the specific virtues of specific bureaucracies.

This is unavoidable. The presence of blind spots is not a flaw in intelligence; it is a condition of intelligence. The presence of blind spots is not the error. Forgetting that they exist is.

IX. Conclusion: The Question of Re-Entrenchment

The inquiry, then, is not whether blind spots can be eliminated. If Goodman and Luhmann are right, they cannot be. To see is to not-see.

The critical question is whether a system, once scaled, retains the capacity for **re-entrenchment**. Can a system built on solidified predicates retain the plasticity to un-make and re-make its own categories when the "load" of the unobserved becomes critical? Or does the mass of the blind spot eventually exceed the operational coherence of the system itself?

Part of the Sum Bunny Canon (Ark Hive Press, 2025).

This was written through a collaboration between a human author and AI systems acting as analytical tools. The machines provided structure; the human provided judgment. Nothing appears here that the author did not personally create, refine, choose, and claim.

HEY JOSIANE,
YOU ARE SUNSHINE ON A CLOUDY DAY!
SUM BUNNY LOVES YOU!!!

FREE FLASH